NSF-KITP-14-011, FTPI-MINN-14/6, UMN-TH-3327/14

Remarks on the effect of bound states and threshold in $g-2$

Kirill Melnikov,[1,*] Arkady Vainshtein,[2,3,†] and Mikhail Voloshin[2,4,‡]

[1] *Department of Physics and Astronomy, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA*
[2] *William I. Fine Institute for Theoretical Physics and School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 54555, USA*
[3] *Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of California,Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA*
[4] *Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow 117218, Russia*

Recently, the contribution of positronium bound states to the electron anomalous magnetic moment was computed in Refs.[1, 2]. It was argued there that this $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^5)$ contribution is missed if electron $g-2$ is calculated within conventional perturbative QED and, as such, it must be added to the perturbative five-loop result. We show that this conclusion is flawed and that no additional contributions to $g-2$ are generated in QED beyond the perturbation theory.

arXiv:1402.5690v2 [hep-ph] 13 Mar 2014

Recently, the contribution of positronium bound states to electron anomalous magnetic moment was computed in Refs. [1, 2]. The calculation proceeds as follows. Consider the contribution of the photon vacuum polarization in QED (with electrons and photons only) to the electron $g-2$. We wish to compute this class of diagrams using dispersion representation for the vacuum polarization. The corresponding formula is well-known [3]. It reads

$$a_e(\mathrm{vp}) = \frac{g_e-2}{2} = \frac{\alpha}{\pi^2}\int\limits_0^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{s}\,\mathrm{Im}\,\Pi(s)\,K(s)\,, \qquad (1)$$

where the kernel $K(s)$ is

$$K(s) = \int\limits_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\,\frac{x^2(1-x)}{x^2+(1-x)s/m_e^2}\,. \qquad (2)$$

The imaginary part of the vacuum polarization function $\Pi(s)$ can be represented as a sum of contributions of positronium bound states and the continuum contribution

$$\mathrm{Im}\,\Pi(s) = 16\pi^2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{|\Psi_n(0)|^2}{M_n}\,\delta(s-M_n^2)+\theta(s-4m_e^2)\,C(s). \qquad (3)$$

In that formula [1, 2], $M_n = (2m_e + E_n)$, $E_n = -m_e\alpha^2/4n^2$, and $|\Psi_n(0)|^2 = m_e^3\alpha^3/(8\pi n^3)$ are the parameters of the S-wave positronium bound states.

It is well-known that bound-state contributions in Eq. (3) can not be obtained at any fixed order in perturbation theory in QED; rather a summation of infinite series of Feynman diagrams generated by exchanges of Coulomb photons is required. Both Refs. [1, 2] use this observation as an argument that the contribution of the positronium poles to $\Pi(s)$ is beyond the reach of conventional QED perturbation theory. They therefore suggest that the shift in the anomalous magnetic moment [1, 2] that one obtains by substituting the first term in Eq. (3), representing the sum over bound states, into Eq. (1)

$$a_e(\mathrm{vp})^{\mathrm{poles}} = \frac{\alpha^5}{4\pi}\,\zeta(3)\left(8\ln 2-\frac{11}{2}\right), \qquad (4)$$

must be added to the five-loop result of Ref. [4].

We would like to argue that this conclusion is wrong. Indeed, it is obvious that this procedure can only be correct if the continuum in Eq. (3) generates the same contribution to electron $g-2$ as what is obtained within conventional perturbative QED, at least through five-loops. We will show that this is *not* the case. In fact, the non-perturbative part of the pole contribution is completely canceled by non-perturbative corrections to the continuum. This cancellation was actually discovered long ago in the framework of sum rules, see Refs. [5–7].

The non-perturbative nature of the positronium pole contributions can be understood as its non-analytic dependence on the fine structure constant. Indeed, consider the case when the sign of α is reversed, so attraction is changed to repulsion. There is no bound states in this case and the pole contribution vanishes. This implies that α-expansion around $\alpha = 0$ can not be constructed for this contribution. To cover cases of both positive and negative α, we re-write the pole contribution as

$$a_e(\mathrm{vp})^{\mathrm{poles}} = \frac{\alpha^5+|\alpha|^5}{8\pi}\,\zeta(3)\left(8\ln 2-\frac{11}{2}\right). \qquad (5)$$

An appearance of $|\alpha|$ explicitly demonstrates non-analyticity.

We will now show that the non-analytical $\mathcal{O}(|\alpha|^5)$ term in Eq.(5) is canceled by the continuum contribution,

$$a_e(\mathrm{vp})^{\mathrm{cont}} = \frac{\alpha}{\pi^2}\int\limits_{4m_e^2}^{\infty}\frac{\mathrm{d}s}{s}\,C(s)K(s). \qquad (6)$$

We will focus on the lower integration region near the boundary $s = 4m_e^2$ in Eq. (6) which is responsible for the non-analytical behavior.

Close to the electron-positron threshold, the imaginary part of the photon vacuum polarization function $\Pi(s)$ is

*Electronic address: melnikov@pha.jhu.edu
†Electronic address: vainshte@umn.edu
‡Electronic address: voloshin@umn.edu

known to all orders in α. Indeed, for $s = (2m_e + E)^2$ with $E \ll m_e$

$$\Pi(s) = \frac{2\pi\alpha}{m_e^2}\, G(0,0,E) + \text{const}\,, \tag{7}$$

where the subtraction constant is included for the purpose of making the right-hand side finite, and $G(0,0,E)$ is the non-relativistic Green's function of the Coulomb problem $G(\vec{x},\vec{y},E) = \langle\vec{x}|\,(H-E)^{-1}\,|\vec{y}\rangle$. Therefore, close to threshold, the continuum contribution is related to the imaginary part of the Coulomb Green's function which, for positive energies, is given by the Sommerfeld factor

$$C(s) = \frac{2\pi\alpha}{m_e^2}\,\mathrm{Im}\,G(0,0,E) = \frac{\pi\alpha^2}{2}\frac{1}{1-e^{-\pi\alpha/\beta}}\,. \tag{8}$$

Here we have introduced the velocity $\beta = \sqrt{1-4m^2/s} \approx \sqrt{E/m}$. Expanding this expression in α, we obtain $\beta \to 0$ limit for $C(s)$ that is generated in fixed order perturbation theory of QED. It reads

$$C(s) = \frac{\alpha\beta}{2}\left(1 + \frac{\pi\alpha}{2\beta} + \frac{\pi^2\alpha^2}{12\beta^2} - \frac{\pi^4\alpha^4}{720\beta^4} + ...\right). \tag{9}$$

It is clear from this expression that the series do not converge in the threshold region where $\beta \sim \alpha$ and a proper computation of its contribution to $g-2$ requires summation of infinite series in α/β. By the criterion adopted in Refs. [1, 2], this is a contribution that is beyond any fixed-order perturbative calculation.

To compute the contribution of this $\beta \sim \alpha$ region to electron $g-2$, we write $\mathrm{d}s \approx 8m^2\beta\mathrm{d}\beta$ and find for the continuum part

$$\begin{aligned} a_e(\mathrm{vp})^{\mathrm{cont}} &= \frac{\alpha^2}{\pi} K(4m_e^2) I(\alpha,\beta_0)\,, \\ I(\alpha,\beta_0) &= \int\limits_0^{\beta_0} \mathrm{d}\beta\, \frac{\alpha\beta}{1-e^{-\pi\alpha/\beta}}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

The upper integration boundary $\pi\alpha \ll \beta_0 \ll 1$ is introduced to make the threshold integral well defined. All contributions to $\Pi(s)$ coming from the region $\beta > \beta_0$ are obviously "perturbative", while the "non-perturbative" contribution appears from the integration over velocities $\beta \sim \alpha$. To isolate the contribution of this region, we subtract and add back the Taylor expansion of the integrand in Eq. (10) at large β. We find

$$I(\alpha,\beta_0) = I_1(\alpha,\beta_0) + I_2(\alpha,\beta_0), \tag{11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int\limits_0^{\beta_0} \mathrm{d}\beta\beta\alpha\left[\frac{\beta}{\pi\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\pi\alpha}{12\beta}\right]\,, \\ I_2 &= \int\limits_0^{\beta_0} \mathrm{d}\beta\beta\alpha\left[\frac{1}{1-e^{-\pi\alpha/\beta}} - \frac{\beta}{\pi\alpha} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\pi\alpha}{12\beta}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The integral I_1 can be computed explicitly; it is defined by the upper integration boundary and is "perturbative". We do not consider it further.

In the second integral I_2 due to its convergence at $\beta \gg \pi\alpha$ the upper integration boundary β_0 can be set to infinity. The integral I_2 is therefore "non-perturbative": it receives contributions from the integration region $\beta \sim \alpha\pi$ and it is not possible to compute it by perturbative expansion of the integrand in powers of α.

It is straigthforward to determine I_2/α^3 by numerical integration. To make analytical computation, it is convenient to use the representation

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{1-e^{-\pi\alpha/\beta}} - \frac{\beta}{\pi\alpha} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\pi\alpha}{12\beta} \\ &= -\frac{\alpha}{2\pi\beta}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n^2}\frac{(\alpha/2n)^2}{\beta^2+(\alpha/2n)^2}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

which naturally appears in the Coulomb Green's function (see Eq. (23) below). Then, the integral I_2 takes the form

$$I_2 = -\frac{\alpha^2}{2\pi}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n^2}\int\limits_0^{\infty}\mathrm{d}\beta\,\frac{(\alpha/2n)^2}{\beta^2+(\alpha/2n)^2}. \tag{14}$$

Note that the integral depends on α^2 so it does not change sign when the sign of α is reversed. The simple integration gives

$$I_2 = -\frac{|\alpha|^3}{8}\,\zeta(3)\,. \tag{15}$$

Finally, we use $K(4m_e^2) = 8\ln(2) - 11/2$ and the above result for I_2 to derive the non-perturbative continuum contribution to $g-2$. We find

$$a_e(\mathrm{vp})^{\mathrm{cont,np}} = -\frac{|\alpha|^5}{8\pi}\,\zeta(3)\left(8\ln(2) - \frac{11}{2}\right). \tag{16}$$

Adding the pole contribution Eq. (5) and the continuum contribution Eq. (16), we observe the cancellation of the non-analytical dependence on $|\alpha|$. The result reads

$$a_e(\mathrm{vp}) = \frac{\alpha^5}{8\pi}\,\zeta(3)\left(8\ln(2) - \frac{11}{2}\right). \tag{17}$$

We will now show that this analytic in α contribution can be obtained using conventional perturbation theory, in spite of the fact that it appears to be coming from positronium poles, Eq. (5). To see this, we focus on the threshold region where, as we already mentioned, the vacuum polarization contribution is proportional to Green's function of the Coulomb problem and where non-perturbative modifications in the spectral density arise. Ignoring changes of all functions that are smooth at threshold, we find

$$a_e(\mathrm{vp})^{\mathrm{thr}} = \frac{2\alpha^2 K(4m_e^2)}{\pi m_e^3}\int \mathrm{d}E\;\mathrm{Im}\,G_E(0,0,E). \tag{18}$$

To calculate this integral, we note that the Green's function satisfies the dispersion relation

$$G_E(0,0,E) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int\limits_{E_1}^{\infty} \mathrm{d}E' \, \frac{\mathrm{Im}\, G(0,0,E')}{E'-E-i0}\,, \qquad (19)$$

where $E_1 = -m_e\alpha^2/4$ is the binding energy of the positronium ground state. Formally taking the limit $E \to -\infty$ in the above expression, we obtain

$$\lim_{E\to-\infty} \pi E G_E(0,0,E) = -\int\limits_{E_1}^{\infty} \mathrm{d}E' \, \mathrm{Im}\, G(0,0,E')\,. \quad (20)$$

Therefore, Eq. (18) can be cast into the form where the integral of the spectral density is traded for the computation of Green's function of the Coulomb problem at large *negative* energy, far away from all the poles and singularities that are present in spectral density

$$a_e(\mathrm{vp})^{\mathrm{thr}} \approx -\frac{2\alpha^2 K(4m_e^2)}{\pi m_e^3} \times \lim_{E\to-\infty} \left[\pi E G_E(0,0,E)\right]. \qquad (21)$$

Green's function of a Coulomb problem at large negative energies can be calculated *perturbatively* without any reference to its spectral density and non-trivial effects there both in bound states and continuum, by iterating the equation

$$G = G_0 - G_0 V G \qquad (22)$$

in the Coulomb potential V. This is exactly equivalent to what is done in conventional perturbative computations, where all diagrams are calculated by performing the Wick rotation with subsequent integration over the loop momenta. In doing so, one maps the problem from a Minkowski one to an Euclidean one and cleanly avoids all singularities associated with multi-particle thresholds.

Perturbative expansion of Green's function at large negative energies can be found from the following representation [6, 7]

$$\begin{aligned} G(0,0,E) =& \frac{im_e k}{4\pi} - \frac{m_e^2\alpha}{4\pi}\log(-ikr_0) \\ &- \frac{m_e^3\alpha^2}{8\pi}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n^2}\frac{1}{(m_e\alpha/2n)+ik}\,, \end{aligned} \qquad (23)$$

where $E = k^2/m_e$, and $\log r_0$ is a subtraction constant that is absorbed in the constant term in Eq.(7). To compute the negative energy asymptotic, we use $k = i\kappa$, $\kappa > 0$. Expanding Eq. (23) in series in α and keeping track of the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^3)$ contribution, we obtain

$$G^{(3)}\Big(0,0,-\frac{\kappa^2}{m}\Big) = \frac{m_e^4\alpha^3\zeta(3)}{16\pi\kappa^2}\,. \qquad (24)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{E\to-\infty}\Big[\pi E G^{(3)}(0,0,E)\Big] = \\ &\lim_{\kappa\to\infty}\left[-\pi\frac{\kappa^2}{m}G^{(3)}\right] = -\frac{m_e^3\alpha^3\zeta(3)}{16}\,. \end{aligned} \qquad (25)$$

Using this result in Eq. (21), we obtain the contribution shown in Eq. (17). Since the above derivation relies solely on the properties of Green's function in the region where perturbative description is justified, we conclude that the non-perturbative effects cancel out in the sum of positronium poles and continuum contributions. The sum matches perturbative correction to $a_e(\mathrm{vp})$ at order $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^5)$.

We note that absence of non-perturbative contributions can be also understood by regulating threshold singularities with the photon mass. Indeed, if we introduce the non-vanishing photon mass $\lambda \ll m_e$ and keep it such that $\alpha m_e/\lambda \ll 1$, no bound states can appear in the spectral density. However, the smooth limit $\lambda \to 0$ must exist in the each order in α which ensures that "non-perturbative" contributions are absent. Instead of the photon mass we can cut the Coulomb potential at distances $1/(m_e\alpha) \gg r \gg 1/m_e$ without changing the $g-2$ result (17).

Finally, we note that the argumentation presented here is general and applies beyond the case of anomalous magnetic moments. In fact, for any QED or QCD observable that requires the knowledge of any two-point function in the Eucledean region, perturbation theory gives complete description up to non-perturbative vacuum condensates parametrized by matrix elements of local operators [5–7]. However, it never happens that a summation of infinite classes of Feynman diagrams enhanced at any threshold generates additional effects beyond perturbation theory, in spite of highly non-trivial behavior of threshold spectral densities [11]. The misunderstanding of this fact, as illustrated by Refs. [1, 2] and a much earlier discussion of how $t\bar{t}$ threshold effects may affect precision electroweak observables such as the ρ-parameter [8–10], appears to be quite common. We hope that the present note will help to clarify it.

Acknowledgments: The work of K.M. is partially supported by US NSF under grants PHY-1214000. A.V. thanks for hospitality the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics where his research is supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. NSF PHY11-25915. The work of M.V. is supported in part by the DOE grant DE-FG02-94ER40823.

[1] G. Mishima, *Bound State Effect on the Electron g-2,* arXiv:1311.7109 [hep-ph].

[2] M. Fael and M. Passera, *On the positronium contribution to the electron g-2,* arXiv:1402.1575 [hep-ph].

[3] For a review, see e.g. F. Jegerlehner, Springer Tracts Mod. Phys. **226**, Springer-Verlag, 2008; K. Melnikov and A. Vainshtein, Springer Tracts Mod. Phys. **216**, Springer-Verlag, 2006.

[4] T. Aoyama, M. Hayakawa, T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 111808 (2012) [arXiv:1205.5370 [hep-ph]].

[5] V.A. Novikov, L.B. Okun, M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein, M.B. Voloshin and V.I. Zakharov, Phys. Rept. **41**, 1 (1978).

[6] M.B. Voloshin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **36**, 143 (1982) [Yad. Fiz. **36**, 247 (1982)].

[7] M.B. Voloshin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **40**, 662 (1984) [Yad. Fiz. **40**, 1039 (1984)]. M.B. Voloshin,

[8] B.A. Kniehl, J.H. Kühn and R.G. Stuart, Phys. Lett. **B 214** (1988), 621.

[9] B.A. Kniehl, A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. **D 47** (1993), 883.

[10] F.J. Yndurain, Phys. Lett. **B**321 (1994), 400.

[11] B. H. Smith and M. B. Voloshin, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 5251 (1995) [hep-ph/9401357].